9/6/06

Ian,

As promised, herewith:

a) A print out of your critique annotated with highlighted passages, each with an identification number. The first digit of the ID is the page number of the critique, and the second number is the particular point.

b) My responses to your critique, numbered in the same manner.

c) Re item 5.16, the reference you requested.

d) Re new material, my file 841D “Supplies” (did I include this in the diskette which I sent to you?) The enclosure “Supplies” refers

e) The enclosure HMAS *Canberra* is unrelated to this issue, but I thought you might like to take a copy of it for future use elsewhere.

f) Re *Cerberus* ITF publication, same comment as for “e” above

g) Re your suggestion of splitting the info several ways, I have collected quite a bit on the pre 1955 three types of RAN airborne radar, viz ASV 19B, the ‘Ash Bomb’ and the air intercept AI 17, including some good colour photos. So this is another avenue for consideration. Saywell’s photo of the AI 17 Gyro Gun sight, and Chris Poole’s shot of the ASV 19B are examples.

h) On the point of illustrations, Bob Slatyer’s drawings of *Shropshire* and my photo of *Watson* might be worth including. As well, some of the illustrations in the “flixco” web site might be suitable, providing no copyright issue arises.

i) The GCI transmitter circuit diagram might also be of interest.

j) For a laugh, and not suitable for inclusion are the Melbourne “Sun” news clipping, and the drawing of the door sign.

Given that there are still big holes in some of my data, and that there are avenues for research to fill these holes, what do you recommend? Can these references which you provided to me be accessed by internet? If not, it becomes a case of travelling to Canberra, and possibly Melbourne to view these, or paying money and waiting weeks, as I did with MP1049/5, 2037/8/364, for photocopies, and with the possibility that the info received has little relevance.

Ian, in conclusion, your critique and covering email is the type of guidance I needed 6 months ago. No point in going over old ground, but now that I have a better understanding of what is required, it is likely that any future input from me will be considered more suitable for publication in a scientific journal.

Cheers,

George